UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Christ in Rags - - *George E. O'Dell*

New Light on Character Building - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

The Assembly of Hope - *Serge Fliegers*

How Our Faith Began - - - - - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

Goethe: A Universal Mind - *Leonard B. Gray*

How Religious Are You? - - - - - - - - - - *William P. Jenkins*

Religion Versus - - *Sheldon Shepard*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVI NUMBER 5

Chicago, November-December, 1950

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

LeGarde S. Doughty: Poetry Editor of *The Humanist.*

Sylvanus M. Duvall: Professor, George Williams College, Chicago.

Serge Fliegers: Editor of *Inter-Continental Press* and correspondent for *Worldover Press.*

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of The First Congregational Church, Lynn, Massachusetts.

William P. Jenkins: Minister of The First Unitarian Congregation of Toronto.

George E. O'Dell: Formerly, Ethical Culture Leader in the United States and Editor of *The Standard;* now residing in England.

Sheldon Shepard: President of the California Universalist Convention.

Horace Westwood: Formerly, Minister of The Unitarian Church of Charleston, South Carolina.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and journalist.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 83

ARTICLES—

The Christ in Rags—GEORGE E. O'DELL 84
New Light on Character Building—VICTOR S. YARROS 85
The Assembly of Hope—SERGE FLIEGERS 87
How Our Faith Began—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 88
Goethe: A Universal Mind—LEONARD B. GRAY 90
How Religious Are You?—WILLIAM P. JENKINS 94
Religion Versus—SHELDON SHEPARD 97

POETRY

Seven Stanzas for Man—LEGARDE S. DOUGHTY 96

THE STUDY TABLE—

Metaphysics—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 98
Spiritualism As a Faith—HORACE WESTWOOD 98
An Inclusive Volume—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 98
A Stirring Story—CURTIS W. REESE 98

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 99

THE FIELD—

The McCarran Act—*Feature Press Service* 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The McCarran Act

The American Civil Liberties Union Board of Directors announced September 25 the Union's "readiness to aid in court tests of those provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which we regard as unconstitutional."

The sweeping anti-subversive legislation, known as the McCarran Act, was passed by the Senate and House over President Truman's veto. Its major provisions include: registration of all Communist and Communist-front organizations with the government, including individual registration of members of Communist groups; new restrictions on immigration and naturalization, barring from entry to the country persons who have ever belonged to the Communist party; denying naturalization to a person joining any Communist or Communist-front organization within ten years after entry; and in time of war emergency the right to hold Communists and other potential saboteurs in detention camps.

In its statement, the ACLU stated: "As uncompromising opponents of Communist tyranny, and all other forms of totalitarianism, we deplore most of the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950... They endanger the constitutional rights of all American citizens, and weaken instead of strengthen our national security against subversive acts. They embarrass our democracy in its world-wide struggle for the minds of men, by making us appear hypocritical rather than sincere in our professed devotion to civil liberties."

The ACLU said that the final omnibus form of this legislation "lumps together matters which should have been dealt with separately, and contains last-minute provisions which are of great importance, but which were given no chance of thorough discussion." The Union charged that many Senators and Congressmen seem to have hastily succumbed to popular hysteria, abdicating their proper function as rational and discriminating representatives."

In a general appeal, the Union said: "We call on all Americans not to let the passage of this act cause a general cancellation of free speech and other civil liberties—either by

(*Continued on page* 95)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVI NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1950 No. 5

EDITORIAL

Constantly rehashing and reconsidering matters of Unitarian belief and polity that should be regarded as settled is a waste of time and energy. Unitarian history and current temper commit us to ways that should be regarded as enduring. In the matter of local autonomy there is no likelihood that individual churches will ever surrender their independence. No Association or Conference can tell a local church what it can or cannot do. The right of a local church to determine its own affairs is sacred and its abrogation would be the death of Unitarianism as it has been known historically and as it is known today. It is likewise in the matter of regional independence. The American Unitarian Association has no authority over the Western Unitarian Conference and the other areas that are similarly organized. The Western Unitarian Conference has no authority over the Iowa Unitarian Association and other State Conferences. And no State Conference has any authority over a local church. Also auxiliary bodies, such as the General Alliance on the national level and the Lake Geneva Assembly on the regional level, are completely free from any control by the national and regional denominational organizations. And nothing is surer than that this general pattern is so fixed in our tradition, current practice, and temper of our people that it should be regarded as the settled policy of our movement. These varied organizations work together as a team on the basis of voluntary cooperation. This is the democratic way, and it is the Unitarian way. Another thing to be taken for granted is that the Unitarian movement has no authoritative creedal statement. In matters of belief the individual Unitarian is the highest ecclesiastical authority. It follows, therefore, that there can be no uniformity in theological conviction among Unitarians. This should be kept firmly in mind in all negotiations with other liberal movements looking toward federal or any other kind of union. Unitarians cannot be put in a theological straightjacket. For Unitarians this freedom is not limited by a Christian, a theistic, or a humanistic pattern. The Unitarian stands out in the wide open and appraises the winds of doctrine from wherever they blow. These are matters over which controversy should cease. In this unsettled world there are a few things that are settled. And one of them is that Unitarianism stands for liberty.

Curtis W. Reese.

The Christ in Rags

GEORGE E. O'DELL

Some sixty years ago I was asked—though a mere stripling just through with school—to try my hand at making a life-size painting in water color to form a sort of altarpiece in a room where a weekly public forum used to meet and where the visiting lecturers included such persons as Bernard Shaw, Sidney Webb, Annie Besant, William Morris, and R. B. Cunninghame Graham. No doubt it was not a good bit of work, but adverse comment used to fall not on me so much as on the artist whose work I had tried to make visible even to a distant eye. For the cartoon was based on an ill-printed halftone which W. T. Stead had included in his *Review of Reviews,* and which startled and shocked almost anyone who contemplated it.

The picture was by a Russian painter, Nicolai Nicolaivitch Gay, and was called "Christ Before Pilate." It had been exhibited in many of the chief European cities, as had Doré's works and Wiertz's terrible "Napoleon in Hell." But with greater acclaim than these, for it was utterly unconventional in its portrayal of Jesus Christ. It was the rough working folk who everywhere flocked to see it. They would go again and again, and they would put up the money to keep it in their city weeks longer than had been intended. Even among them, and certainly among the more respectable visitors, there must have been many a rude shock on first sight, and some must have wept from pity or blushed because of shame. It may even be that Gay's gruesome portrait—perhaps characteristically given by a Russian—helped towards that gathering of proletarian anger which drove the 1905 multitude to seek audience with the Czar—and be smothered in blood—and later in 1917 to turn first to liberal Kerensky and then to bolshevist Lenin.

Jesus and his judge alone appear in the picture—the back of Pilate, the front of Christ; Pilate a magnificent broad-built brute of a man, asking "What is truth?" and not waiting for an answer; Jesus a little scarecrow against a wall, a starved figure, with matted hair, an unkempt beard, hunted eyes, and a garment dreadfully suggestive of mere rags. Pilate painted in patrician scarlet, Jesus in an indigo which seemed best to suggest, yet mercifully to hide, the horror of rags.

Of course, the portrayal hardly followed the gospel story. Here was no handsome "seamless robe" such as might be worth casting lots for, nor did it seem likely that the wearer would ride so apparelled into Jerusalem, even on an ass. Nor had the worst tortures of the sufferer yet been inflicted, such as might help explain the agony in his face. Besides, this was not even a carpenter or any sort of artisan, but just a beggar or a bum. There was nothing of the charm with which a French painter had invested Jesus sitting (in the seamless robe) among Breton fishermen. Here was certainly not the Jesus whom painters through the centuries had depicted in splendid dress or else unclothed so as to allow of clever studies in emaciated anatomy. If anything, Gay had chosen among the gospel accounts, and envisaged Jesus and his apostles as wandering mendicants, not, like Paul, earning a living, but dependent on charity and having nowhere at times to lay their heads. So far as I know, only one even of our modern writers, Lewis Browne, has adopted this aspect of the tale; but mercifully he has not provided pictorial illustrations.

Now, of course, Gay had some historic warrant for making the Christ an obvious beggar. Five hundred years earlier Gautama had changed a prince's dress for that of a mendicant; and after Christ one or another holy man and founder of a monastic order had started out by wearing clothes in which no self-respecting laborer would like to be seen. But the awfulness of Gay's picture is not only in the dirty rags; it is in the expression which he places on the poor victim's face—an expression of passionate resentment, a fierce hatred, presumably for arrogance, greed, class domination, social hypocrisy, such as, along with tenderness and pity for repentant sinners and the poor, flashes out at us from the Biblical record. This must have been what electrified the hordes of common men and women who stared open-eyed and open-mouthed at the picture. Here was a Christianity beyond that of their priests; here was a painter who, in his conception of Jesus, had made himself, in spirit and understanding, one with the least reputable of themselves.

There was much, one may surmise, in Gay's mind of this. It is not by garments that we are to appraise a man. Nor are we to hierarchize men in our thought of them as ranging, say, from carpenter to king! The only safe way is to begin with the down-and-outer; is not he also a man? Our religion must be one of respect for every man. To be a human being—that is what comes first, and our religion, our politics, our economics, our education, our culture, our expectation and solicitude, must start at the bottom if we are to be saved from chalking a line and classifying men as mere animals if below it. Just as the physician sees in the worst case of some disease both the greatest opportunity for study and the greatest triumph in discovering through treating it some way of preventing or curing like cases; just as the dedicated educator delights in taking in hand some dullest of pupils and testing how dullness can be understood and conquered; so should even the lowest of failures in life be recognized as to be saved, or others to be saved from succeeding them, by the appeal even to the tiniest spark of manhood which may remain.

But is not this a Christian convention anyway? Oh, no! In a St. Francis or a General Booth, yes, and in those inspired by such leaders, of whom fortunately there have been many. But it is a commonplace of history that vast numbers of professing Christians have believed otherwise, even still do. To base the idea of human worth even on so august an idea as that of all men being sons of God has not brought conviction. The doubter knew too much about families for that! What about "worthless" children? What about the predestined damned? What about those becoming sons merely by conditional adoption? What, for that matter, about the apparent utter condemnation of Pilates and Pharisees—though explicable in view of a supposed approaching end of an age—by the supreme Son of God? The doctrine of worth has been but feebly effective in reaching the consciences of men.

On any other basis than theistic sonship the demand

that everyone be envisaged as having worth is just as difficult to defend. Yet it can hardly ever have needed justification so much as today. Not only in totalitarian "democracy" but also among "free" peoples the idea is flouted every time we think with unqualified dislike, contempt, or enmity of any or every human being who does not measure up to our notion of what a human being ought to be. It is, alas, only too easy to question why the inefficient, or the self-seeking, should be treated as "equals" with ourselves, with equal "rights," equal parliamentary votes, even equal opportunities—that convenient illusion, since our inherent power to use the "equal" opportunities so differs from person to person. Except in some mystical way we are born neither free nor equal. The argument for democracy is actually only pragmatic—it *works,* after a fashion; but it is in constant danger of breaking down.

There is another justification for democracy which any Christian should find helpful, in common with those not so designating themselves, even though it also is pragmatic, although advanced by a teacher who was an Absolute Idealist in philosophy. Felix Adler, trained in German rigidities, but domiciled in America, and a keen citizen, found it difficult to justify to himself, let alone other people, the idea of human worth on which democracy must surely be based if everyone, and not just the fit, is to be in some practical sense equally counted, and no individuals or classes to be allowed to treat those socially below them as mere instruments of their greed, ambition, or secret making of an oligarchic State. He recognized that the democracy of Jefferson and Lincoln with its roots in English revolutionary thought, needed a more secure foundation than any provided even by them. Men were used to confuse *worth* with *value;* by "worthless" they meant "valueless"—unfitted to serve social ends. Yet, like the noblest sort of Christians, he felt that in the measure that we are ethically religious we feel bound to treat everyone as an end even though he fail to be a means. "Sonship" had but fitfully worked; Jeffersonianism worked only in part. Why or how are we to see in the black or brown man, even in the whining beggar or the criminal about to be executed, a being to be treated as though of worth somehow like our own?

Without such seeing Adler could not be content. Hence his setting up for his own mind of a metaphysical construction—an ideal spiritual universe, the fundamental reality—which, alas, he knew could appeal only to a certain sort of mentality, and which, in truth, has been ignored, as a theory not worth considering, by almost every writer on philosophy in our day. There must be some idea which could reach the mass of men! How verify the notion of universal human worth? Adler fell back on the extraordinary statement that scientific and ethical-religious verifications do not have to be the same. Treat the beggar, the hobo, the derelict as being somehow a creature of worth, to which worth you are called upon by an inner urging to pay homage, *attribute* worth to him, and within yourself will arise an awareness, perhaps only latent before, a humble awareness of worth in yourself. Treat your fellow as even in some metaphysical sense sharing in the highest, and you become conscious of sharing in it also. It *works.*

The idea need not be elaborated here. Suffice it to say that Adler was well aware that this way of behavior, this pragmatic test, is implied in much of the teaching and conduct of Jesus, however variously reported out of inaccurate memories and traditions, as it doubtless was. But he saw that the teaching must be saved from the crudities of the reporters as well as the local and temporal assumptions of the Teacher, and widened beyond the record in the light of modern psychological and social science. It must apply to the patrician as well as the bum; even to Pilate and Caiaphas must be attributed worth and the potentiality, however submerged, for good; and the sins of all such, even though not repented of, must be acknowledged as of social and historic as well as of personal origin. The judge on the bench (Adler often said) should never sentence a culprit without saying in his secret heart: There but for the Grace of God go I! Only that the social forces (which W. T. Stead, though an evangelical Christian, once said *are* the real Grace of God) which make for human goodness have to be more and more organized by man to promote it.

New Light on Character Building

VICTOR S. YARROS

Much has been written and said in recent years, in the religious press, in secular periodicals, in radio discussions, and in scientific books, about the alleged decline in our ethical standards. Little knowledge is, proverbially, a dangerous thing, yet how many adult men and women in any generation can claim more than little—very little—knowledge concerning ethical problems, education in ethics and developed religion, and the right methods of building character, or, in Herbert Spencer's words, educating human emotions?

The young go to kindergartens, schools, colleges, and universities to learn all sorts of knowledge as well as how to behave in a decent, civilized manner, how to control natural appetites and passions, how to resist inescapable temptations, how to react to various experiences and impacts. If educators and philosophers are agreed upon any single proposition, it is this—that mere preaching and sermonizing virtue and goodness is not conducive to those virtues. As one eminent educator said, if your teacher solemnly exhorts you to be good, your impulse is to run out and commit some mischief.

What is true of the teacher is equally true of clergymen or priests, or even parents. No; sermons and preachments have never, of and by themselves, developed character or refined and socialized emotions.

What forces, or factors, have done that in the modern world? A report of an interdenominational committee of ministers, published several months ago, declared that the building of character is the task of the Home, the School, and the Church, but primarily the Home. This conclusion is undeniably true, but it does not take us very far. Is the average home equipped to discharge that responsibility? Or the average school or the average church?

Hardly, is the answer. We have then, obviously, the

preliminary task of educating the parents of the children we are anxious to train and fit for civilized, ethical living. Marx said the Socialists must educate the educators. So must the ethicists of clear and positive convictions. How do we educate adults, who seldom, if ever, return to any type of school or institute? The adult education movement is of course committed to that responsibility, and its potentialities are great. Its potentialities, but not its actualities, alas! It follows that the adult education movement should face more squarely and more consciously its main task—that of combating contemporary moral nihilism, cynicism, misguided and misunderstood "relativity" in ethics. The radical distinction between right and wrong in a civilized society is not discredited or wiped out by the fact that in some savage or primitive tribes killing and stealing are not crimes, but virtues!

Too much preposterous nonsense is heard today in various half-educated circles about the lack of "scientific" warrant for, say, the ethical commandments of the Mosaic code. Those commandments are truly scientific if science, in Huxley's famous phrase, is "organized common sense." Eight or ten thousand years of human experience in all parts of the world, not to mention the experience of perhaps one hundred thousand years of pre-historic life, surely demonstrate the necessity and utility of the basic ethical commandments. The moral leaders and teachers, then, need not attack ethical relativity. It is, simply, irrelevant to our situation and our problem here and now.

But let us be clear and candid on one point of cardinal importance. The practical application of the ethical commandments in a modern, industrialized, monopoly-ridden society, with it giant corporations, public utilities, colossal banks and insurance companies, mass production and the assembly line, powerful labor unions, presents serious difficulties. Many of our business executives are church-goers, yet they would be surprised to hear that modern methods of financing industry, of distributing the products of labor, of dealing with unions and union officers, of providing for the safety and welfare of their employes, particularly mine workers, violate several of the commandments. In a simple, agricultural community, or very small town, killing, stealing, bearing false witness are offenses no sane person will commit or condone. In our complex society, killing and stealing can be indirect, far from obvious. Negligence, greed, indifference can lead to wholesale destruction of life. Emphasis on the interest of stockholders, legitimate in itself, may involve sacrifice of the superior rights or claims of the workers. Yet no thoughtful student of ethics and economics will contend that the Golden Rule cannot be applied to modern societies without inflicting injury and injustice on the investors, the managers, the directors of our great enterprises. All that can be affirmed is that the moral leaders must be conversant with economic principles and economic history.

Moralizing the home, then, means moralizing industry, trade, and commerce. Parents who earn their living ethically teach ethical behavior by example, by the atmosphere of their homes and offices. Where, as is now the case, the way of life contradicts the professions made, the lip-service rendered to ethics, children will not fail to perceive the flagrant contradiction and treat the empty professions with scornful cynicism. No educator will blame them.

We must bear in mind, too, the fact established by the new psychology, including the Freud-Jung-Adler contributions thereto, that the education of children does not begin at school, does not await formalities. It begins almost at birth. Conduct is three-fourths of life, as Matthew Arnold contended, and conduct subtly, insidiously, unwittingly impresses children and implants ideas in them.

Conduct, of course, is not limited to business ways and to social intercourse. It embraces attitudes and relationships within the family. If the parents are dignified, considerate, tolerant, self-respecting, and mindful of the rights and feelings of others, they will infect their children by their quiet example. Thus the latter's emotions will be educated and their character developed.

Turning now to the school and the church, it scarcely needs stressing that these institutions likewise should and must teach or educate, not by preaching generalities, but by conscious example and conduct. In the schools, lower and higher, there are numerous opportunities, not fully improved, of socializing and civilizing emotions, or building character. We know the moral value and effect of wholesome sport, of teamwork directed toward proper ends, of steady cooperation under trusted and competent guidance, of "learning by doing." Educators have long recognized these truths, but in practice they have been too often ignored or disregarded. Where sport is commercialized and vulgarized, where fraud and trickery are employed to insure success, where "the bitch-goddess, Success", is worshipped and dependence on first principles of ethics is forgotten, sport degrades character, instead of ennobling it.

Weak and secret, hypocritical concessions to race and religious prejudice by educational institutions certainly do not help character building. Prejudice should be resisted and fought in our schools in every possible way, on the campus, in the classes, in laboratories, student organizations, faculty formation, promotions, rewards of earnest research. Platitudes and subterfuges, dodges and masks in the service of prejudice and injustice deceive no one who is not willing to be deceived. The school or college atmosphere is more influential than the lecture or textbook. The atmosphere is created not by the immature, misguided students, but by the faculty and the administration. Whatever is done in school or college should be done in sincere conformity with the professed principles, not in violation of them. Anti-Semitism exemplified by fraternities undoes all the theoretical good supposed to be effected by lectures in opposition to that pestilential evil. So does a quota system adopted to reduce the normal representation in the student body of a given ethnic group or race.

The churches have their sins to answer for. The Sunday sermon and the mid-week prayer meeting cannot prevail over and against the practices of the congregations through the rest of the week. Segregation and discrimination condemned by religious and ethical doctrines should never be tacitly approved by the churches. Interracial, interdenominational, interreligious associations and activities should be encouraged and aided. To work together for worthy ends is to sap and undermine pernicious antipathies and prejudices. The church can be and should be a center for beneficial and public-spirited activities in its neighborhood and municipality. "By their fruits ye shall know them" applies to organizations as well as to individuals. The church, too, can set examples in addition to interpreting and reinterpreting ancient formulas. All moral issues are the proper business of the churches. To insist on moral conduct is not to "meddle in party politics." The

term "politics" has been debased: let us return to Plato's and Aristotle's definition of politics.

Like many others, I have been puzzled by Alfred North Whitehead's saying that "religion is what you are when alone." This seems to contradict the more reasonable and progressive view, that religion is essentially social, as ethics are. But reflection has convinced me that what Whitehead intended to express is the truth that we must, when we are alone, and can search our own hearts, honestly ask ourselves whether we are sincere in our professions, and actually living up to them. We may deceive others; we cannot deceive ourselves. A sense of sin is, in the last analysis, a sense of falling short, of failing to do what we know we ought to do. Few men are conscious hypocrites, while many, too many, refuse to look unpleasant facts in the face, to call themselves to account, to pass judgment upon themselves and resolve to be more consistent, more responsible, more worthy of the respect we expect from the community.

Ours is an age of speed, noise, and sensationalism. We cannot isolate or insulate ourselves, and escape-reading is a sad waste of our leisure time. Yet we must continue to teach, and exemplify, the gospel of simple living, high thinking, suspension of judgment where evidence is insufficient, tolerance for ideas we dislike, the use of leisure for elevated purposes. We must never lose sight of first principles. And, to repeat, we cannot introduce our children to such principles too soon. If we delay and neglect our duty to the children and to society, the commercialized press, the vulgarized and moronic movies, the blatant and mendacious advertising on the radio will anticipate us and perhaps render our belated efforts futile.

The Assembly of Hope

SERGE FLIEGERS

The General Assembly of 1949 was called the "Peace Assembly" by its President, General Carlos Romulo of the Philippines. Seven months later, war broke out in Korea. The more recent gathering of sixty nations could be nicknamed, more realistically, the "Assembly of Hope."

The importance of this meeting lies not so much in the flood of resolutions, speeches, and formal reports produced as in the enormous behind-the-scenes activity. Every U.N. delegate interviewed by this correspondent realized that the alternative to conciliation is conflagration. With few exceptions they redoubled their efforts working deep into the night and during week-ends to get together on an informal basis for an answer to the haunting question: war or peace?

One of Andrei Vishinsky's close advisers was asked bluntly by the present writer: "Will we have war?" The Soviet diplomat drew himself up and replied: "Do you mean to stand there and infer that we are planning for war? We are all men like you; and like you we want to live." A Polish delegate further elaborated: "There is a definite spirit of conciliation among the Soviet block of countries." (Names are withheld, since their use would dry up invaluable sources of news.)

There is no doubt that the Soviets came in a much less ferocious mood than before. This is not only symbolized by pictures of Vishinsky shaking hands with Acheson, but by the spectacle of dead-pan Jacob Malik drinking American Coca-Cola and forcing a grin to his face as he talks with a spokesman for a United States women's group.

This new attitude is viewed with caution. For an explanation we went to such specialists as John Hickerson, Assistant Secretary of State for U.N. Affairs, and John Foster Dulles, Republican foreign policy adviser to the United States. They share the opinion of many skilled observers that Russian smiles have to be taken with a large grain of Siberian rock salt. The new Soviet behavior—the result of direct orders from the Kremlin—may be based on two factors. First, that the Soviet peoples, still smarting from the devastation of the last war and continuing low living standards, are unprepared for another major conflict. Second, it is felt that the Soviet Union is frantically playing for time, both for itself and for its ally, Communist China.

From talks with Soviet delegates in U.N. corridors I am convinced the United States action in Korea took the Kremlin completely by surprise. Russia now fears the Korean war will prove to be a catalyst for the military union of the democratic powers. Hence it seeks to lull the democracies into a new sense of safety, even with temporary compromises until the U.S.R.R. and Red China are ready for the next step.

For that next step, both sides are girding. In Burma, Indo-China, Siam, Malaya, and far-off Sinkiang, Communist "activators" have been trying for further coups, with varying success. The white man from the West, with the stigma of long exploitation upon him, appears able to do little except carry out "police actions."

Prime Minister Nehru of India, with his tremendous political and intellectual prestige, is combating as best he can the idea of kicking out the white man altogether. He was given strong support when Secretary of State Acheson made his now famous proposals in this Assembly to inaugurate a world-wide policy of land reform. To many Asiatics this sounded like an astonishing right-about-face by a government which had backed such men as Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, and Emperor Bao Dai, men dedicated to the support of Asia's landed gentry. But as Indian Ambassador to Washington, Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit put it to this correspondent: "The time is past for us to try to save face. Now we must try to save our necks." Mrs. Pandit, Nehru's sister, has been one of the outstanding personalities in the liaison between India and the Western powers in their joint effort to recapture the confidence of Asia.

I was able to interview an unofficial representative of Red China who had come to the Assembly as an "off the record" observer. He asked that his name be withheld, but said:

> Communist China feels that it can work with the Soviet Union for an equitable basis for peace in the Far East. We would welcome nothing more than to have India join us in our endeavors. After all, the future of Asia lies with the Asiatics, and such proposals as Achesons on land reform come too late and from too far away. The days of the white man in the Far East are definitely over.

He would not answer the question whether he considered the Russians to be white, red, black, or brown!

General Romulo, another Asiatic, told *Worldover Press:*

> Agrarian reforms must take place. In Korea, for example, the re-parcelling of land already accomplished by the Communists should not be undone, save that any further re-parcelling should be done democratically, by paying indemnities to former owners. In the whole of Asia, military victories are not enough. Sweeping reforms must take place, in order that the evils which led Koreans to follow the Communist flag will not be continued or renewed. We cannot win by force of arms alone.

The accent on reform is one heard loudly in this Assembly. This is one thing the delegates have learned as an essential to peace. They have also learned that unless they do their jobs supremely well, war is not far off—hence their unusual restraint and determination.

It is yet to be seen, however, how far the decisions of diplomats reached at Flushing will affect the great mass of humanity. Sitting amid Klieg lights, television cameras, microphones, and teletypes, one is apt to lose perspective. That was brought home to this correspondent in the Delegate's Lounge, by a gentleman six feet five in height, with an enormous chest and huge, black handle-bar moustache. "I am Yussuf the Turkish wrestler," he announced, "and I have come to see if I can help the delegation of my country." We explained that Turkey's suave Selim Sarper might not need outside help, but that Russia"s Andrei Vishinsky might be in the market for a bodyguard. "Vishinsky!" Yussuf blustered, "Who's dat?"

How Our Faith Began

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

The beginnings of our faith go back to that experience in the history of mankind when man first felt within himself the stirrings of reason, first began to understand the meaning of freedom, and first knew the thrill of being a "personality" with all that this term implies in the sense of self-respect, initiative, and spiritual integrity. Again, we might say, that our free faith has its roots in man's first conscious attempt to be himself, in the sense of using his own reason and his own creative intelligence and imagination to express and formulate his convictions regarding the supreme values of his existence. In other words, our free faith began with the first "heretic," the first dissenter, i.e. the first person that said "no" when others said "yes," or vice versa, and was carried on by that glorious band of daring spirits which declared that in all matters that count most every human being has the right and duty to make his own decisions and to arrive at his own conclusions. When man first arose to challenge the majority, to defy the conventional attitudes and the current traditions in religion and ethics, that free faith was born which to this day hurls its defiance at all doctrinaire religion, all stereotyped theologies, and all presumptuous authoritarianisms in matters of faith and morals.

More particularly, of course, our free faith with its distinctive rootage in the Judaeo-Christian tradition began with specific historic attitudes of dissent, with certain well-defined "heresies" that back in the early days of the rise of that little Jewish sect known as the "Followers of the Nazarene" or the "Messianists" arose to plague the life and test the temper of the early "Christians."

The first rumblings of dissent in the primitive church arose when the early followers of Jesus of Nazareth began to differ as to the proper evaluation of the person and work of their great leader. There were in those days and especially among the Jewish followers of the Master those that resisted any attempt at making of him either a God-Man or a God. They wanted to keep the natural and lovable "humanity" of the Master which, particularly after the advent of Paul, began to show signs of being perverted by the Oriental tendency to deify great men and to make of popular heroes demigods or gods. These dissenters and their successors lost their battle in the early centuries of the church during the great Christological controversies that declared that Jesus was "very God of very God" and of equal nature with God the Father himself. This process of dehumanizing Jesus found its first official documentation in the Nicene Creed formulated at the famous Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D. The dissenters not only lost their fight, but the doctrine that Jesus was "Lord and God" became for the first time the declared doctrine of the church and remains that to this day. The dissenters at that time, and ever since, were anathematized; excommunication and persecution of "heretics" began, and to this day the Christian Church is split along lines of "Christology"; and those churches, like our own, that refuse to worship Jesus as "Lord and God" are refused the fellowship not only of the so-called "Catholic" churches but also that of most Protestant churches.

Inevitably consequent upon this deifying of Jesus was the adoption of the doctrine of the Trinity. This dogma must have been especially unpalatable to those Jewish men and women who almost exclusively made up the first followers of the Nazarene. They knew only that Jewish monotheism which the People of the Book had guarded so zealously, which Judaism to this day professes in the majestice "Sh'ma," and for which its sons and daughters throughout the ages have willingly laid down their lives. Of course, Jesus himself was a strict Jewish monotheist, nor do we find anywhere within the pages of the New Testament the slightest intimation that either Jesus or his immediate disciples ever dreamed of changing the Unity of God into a Trinity of Divine persons. While the name "Unitarians" for those who opposed the paganizing influences in Christian theology that ultimately led to the prevailing Trinitarianism of our day was hardly used before the sixteenth century, we may say that those who in the early days of the church fought for the preservation of pure Jewish monotheism were the spiritual ancestors of those Christian and other "religious liberals" of later centuries that refused to compromise the doctrine of the Unity of God. Nothing did more to estrange the church from the synagogue and to make that strong missionary appeal to the pagan peoples of the Middle and Near East and of Europe than did the concession to Oriental polytheism and pagan philosophy as ultimately documented in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. To the Jew this doctrine was a monstrous perversion of the original monotheism of the Law, the Prophets, and of

Jesus himself, and this dogma remains to this day a theological and metaphysical monstrosity, one that maintains its position in the system of Christian teaching solely because of the obscurantism of the clergy and the credulity of the laiety. The man of free faith has always protested, if not always in identical forms, against both the elevation of Jesus to the Godhead and the corruption of the concept of Deity by the rationalizations of Trinitarianism; and to this day we of the free faith stand opposed to both of these perversions of that faith which began with the simple precepts of a young Jewish teacher and asked of its followers nothing more than that they "love the Lord their God with all their heart and their neighbor as themselves."

But there were other areas of religious teaching where early in the history of the church the inquiring mind and the critical spirit asserted themselves and began that tradition of revolt, dissent, and vigorous counter-evangelization that to this day remains alive and active not only throughout Christendom but everywhere among men that seek true religion in terms of worship of God through service of fellow man. It is this revolt against the stereotype of tradition, against the presumption of cleric, priest, and parson, against the absolute authority of ecclesiastical institution and bibliolatry that has always acted as a leaven in religion and, pray God, will in days to come act as a purge of those forces that are hindering the progress of man and society towards justice, community, and brotherhood.

There were at least three other doctrines of early church-history against which the first dissenters and heretics directed their shafts of criticism and their strategy of revolt. These were: the doctrine worked out by Augustine, and later further developed by the great Swiss reformer John Calvin, that man even from infancy has a nature totally depraved by sin and can be "saved" only by the supernatural grace of God. This is the doctrine of "original sin" and all that pertains thereto. Then there is the doctrine, also stemming from Augustine and emphasized by Calvin and other Protestant reformers, that God from the beginning, even from eternity, by "election" chose or "predestined" certain souls to be saved and others to be damned. And there is the doctrine that Jesus by a so-called "vicarious atonement" saved men by suffering in their stead, as their substitute, thereby, provided they believe in Him, "redeeming them from sin, death, and the Devil."

In the words of a recent church historian,"it was against the two great central doctrines of orthodox theology (the Deity of Jesus and the Trinity), together with these three minor ones [mentioned above], that the pioneers of Unitarianism raised their protest, as inconsistent with Scriptures and offensive to reason and the moral sense."

To sum up "How Our Faith Began": It began when back in the days of the early church certain thinking individuals took seriously the two fundamental tenets of all high religion, viz., that all men are children of God, and that as children of the Most High all of us have the privilege as well as the duty to approach Truth with a sense of that dignity and personal responsibility which is inherent in the concepts of freedom and reason. It is not demanded of us that we give slavish obedience and unreasoning assent to the teachings and doctrines of some external authority that has established itself and maintains its power not with recourse to obvious truth and to the faculties of spiritual perception but with the power of the sword and with political prestige. It is demanded of us that at all times we come to terms with the truth as revealed in the experiences of the race and attested by that "inner light" which the Creator and Ruler of the Universe has vouchsafed his children and which is certain to lead us "into all the truth" provided we seek honestly, fearlessly, and with a humble spirit.

We, the children of those gallant pioneers of centuries ago, owe it to them and to our children to stand as uncompromisingly today for free inquiry and free worship in religion as did they who suffered excommunication, ban, persecution, and martyrdom for their free faith.

The forces of tyranny and totalitarianism that today threaten our civilization are not only nor always chiefly those of materialistic Communism, of Atheism, or of Secularism; they are equally those of clerical Fascism, of ecclesiastical absolutism, and of spiritual demagoguery. Against these we must wage an energetic and persistent warfare until the darkness of theological obscurantism is dispelled and the threat of dictatorial control of the lives and minds of men is definitely dissipated. Looking back upon the beginnings of our free faith, we may well feel a keen sense of pride that we are the children of such gallant "heretics," and in this pride resolve to come to the aid of every contemporary "heretic" who by exercizing the god-given right "to choose," not only in matters of economics and politics but also in the matter of religion, simply proves that freedom still lives and that the light of reason has not gone out.

Meditation

A. EUSTACE HAYDON

The children of men stand hesitantly on the threshold of cultural maturity.

It has been a long journey from the primeval forests to the modern halls of science and the metropolis of machines. We are not yet accustomed to the marvelous richness of the new era. We are uncertain and bewildered by the endless invitations to novelty. We have not yet outgrown the thought-patterns of our racial childhood. We still wear the colored glasses of sacred tradition to shield our eyes from the blazing light of modern knowledge. We cherish a wardrobe of intellectual garments of the dead past and wear them uncomfortably and awkwardly in the new climate.

It is difficult for us to believe that the era of infancy is over—that the days of dreaming and wish-fulfillment are done; more difficult to accept without whimpering the responsibilities of maturity; still more difficult to use with wisdom the terrifying instruments of power thrust into our unready hands.

Because we have failed to outgrow the habits of our racial immaturity we have blundered close to the brink of destruction. Because we act like willful, irresponsible children in an age that demands moral and mental maturity, the age-old evils—poverty, hunger, starvation, greed, strife and war—prey needlessly upon our helpless multitudes. The vision of the good society, dream of the ages, now waits for us to give it embodiment on the earth.

Let us accept our great good fortune, assume responsibility for living in the most challenging era of all time. With heads held high, and a song in our hearts, let us go forth to the building of a culture nobly worthy of the spirit of man!

Chicago Ethical Society News Letter.

Goethe: A Universal Mind

LEONARD B. GRAY

November 7, 1775, was a great day in a little German town, in the life of Germany's greatest writer, and in the history of literature, for on that day Johann Wolfgang Goethe entered Weimar.

Oh, those glorious first few months Goethe spent in Weimar! How exciting they were for the central figure and for the townspeople who were entranced by the irresistible spell this fascinating and incomparable young man cast upon them! The little provincial town was shaken out of its dull conventionality and complacency. Aristocratic society to which the newcomer was first introduced became alive and agog. Indeed, life for everybody was stirred, toned up, and lifted out of its regular course. People everywhere idolized, lionized, and worshipped the newly famous poet partly because of the startling things he had written but chiefly because the magnetic man himself was far more interesting than his writings. They read and reread *The Sorrows of Werther,* his recently published work, that was running like wildfire over much of Europe. The men, with the exception of Wieland, the well-known poet, put on the Werther costume of blue frock coat and brown waistcoat and breeches, supplied by the Duke in large numbers, and this exception voiced the feelings of many when he said:

> This splendid young man! All that I can say to you on this subject is that since this morning my soul has been as full of Goethe as a dewdrop is full of the morning sun. Viewed from any point, from every angle, he is the greatest, best, most glorious human creature God has ever created.

Many people sought out the new sensation and invited him to their homes. To entertain him and to be entertained by him they arranged numerous banquets, balls, concerts, theatricals, and hunting parties. They went into screams of laughter at his jokes, antics, and pranks. They rejoiced in his playfulness and unconventionality. Readily they took up the amusements and sports he introduced, especially that of skating, never before indulged in by anyone in the town. He had his way with them completely. Nothing was too good for the god. Never before or since was the little town pitched to such a delirium of excitement and joy.

In all history we have read or heard of no lionization of a writer equal to this save that given by Edinburgh to Robert Burns when he appeared in that city with the halo of sudden fame around him. The two enthusiastic receptions were alike in that they were aroused more by the poets' personalities than by their poetry. That given by the large city with its huge population and larger number of learned and distinguished men was more widely spread and more glamorous, but this in the German town—being localized in a smaller area with fewer interests and novelties to attract the attention of the people—was probably more intense. Indeed, the latter—centered around a poet who was then and always much more of a man than a poet—was unparalleled in its intensity. It seemed that the people for a few months could hardly think of anything save Goethe. Narrow-minded, stiff, cultivated Weimar society was overjoyed, lifted up, jerked out of its set pattern, broadened, and thoroughly humanized by this genius and god whose like they had never seen before.

Long after the enthusiasm of the people had subsided and the town had fallen back to its accustomed ways, even long after Goethe had become such a familiar figure on the streets that many had become indifferent to him and his fame, and some even tired of hearing his name praised, the Weimar citizens fondly and sadly looked back to those glorious few months as the brightest in their lives. Glorious days come but seldom to most people, and to some not at all, but they came to the people of that little provincial town in the autumn and winter months of 1775-1776.

We describe those first few months of Goethe's life in Weimar not chiefly to present a bit of interesting history, but rather to describe Goethe and the extraordinary effects that his sudden fame and his personality had upon people. The poet was then in the full bloom of his fair youth. Seldom, if ever, was there a more magnificent and magnetic young man. With play of features remarkable and striking, large and liberally cut in sweeping lines of Greek art, he was often likened to Apollo. Very sensitive and expressive was his mouth with its short arched upper lip. His nose was slightly acquiline, his chin and jaw boldly proportioned, and his head rested on a handsome and muscular neck. He was slightly above middle-size but due to his erect carriage he looked taller than he was, and had the aspect of a large man. What impressed people the most about him were his large, brown brilliant eyes with their piercing glance. He looked so strong, muscular, imposing, and manly that most people felt with Napoleon, who said after first meeting the poet: "There's a man for you." And not a few felt like Lavater, when he said: "You would idolize Goethe. He is the most fearful and amiable of men. He is the incomparable, the fearfully exalted among men." And like Heinse, when he said of the youth, "From top to toe genius, power, strength, a heart full of feeling, a mind full of fire and equipped with the wings of the eagle. Resistance is impossible; he carries everything along with him." It was impossible for strangers to keep their eyes off him, some have testified, and not to feel that an extraordinary youth had come into their midst when he entered a room. It was easily observed that in any company he carried the conversation without trying to do so.

Yes, Goethe was then in the full bloom of his fair youth and in the full bloom of his first fame and popularity among the masses. Seldom again was he to be popular, for his fame henceforth was to be restricted chiefly to the intellectual few. Schiller was to be more widely read and is today, an ex-Nazi youth recently told me, more popular in Germany. But at that time everybody was reading our poet. Young men all over Germany were wearing the Werther costume. In public markets Werther was shown painted on cloth or canvas. In a few years three French translations of the poet's first great work were to appear, and Napoleon was to take it with him on his campaign to Egypt in 1798 and read it seven times, and study it so carefully that he could discuss it point by point with the author in 1808.

How interesting and significant is Goethe's own account of how he came to write *Werther* and why this piece of writing leaped into such meteoric popularity! There had come upon many German young people, the poet tells us in his autobiography, a weariness with life

which not infrequently led to suicide. This weariness was due in no small measure to the serious nature of the German mind which leads to a contemplation of the transient nature and worthlessness of earthly possessions and of earthly existence itself. Also, the serious, sensitive youth was unusually troubled and pained by the unceasing return of its faults. And this seriousness and disgust with life on the part of the German youth at that time was greatly increased by much reading of English literature which, especially in its poetry, was full of earnest melancholy. Serious English poetry, especially that of Shakespeare, undermining the worth of human nature, was suitable to the peculiar type of German mind just then and it was by far the favorite of the German youth. Particularly Hamlet and his soliloquies haunted the minds of Goethe and his young friends. Almost everyone, it seemed, knew the chief passages of the play by heart and loved to recite them. Frustrated and tortured by unsatisfied passions and by what they considered harsh and confining surroundings, such reading greatly assisted not a few German young people to imagine that their lot was worse than it actually was, as one person expressed it before *Werther* appeared:

> To griefs congenial prone,
> More wounds than nature gave he knew;
> While misery's form his fancy drew
> In dark ideal hues and horrors not its own.

Thus the mind of young Germany was perfectly conditioned to respond to the particular chord Werther would strike. Goethe himself found that he was in this psychological predicament, and he considered various ways of committing suicide, the chief being with a handsome, well-polished dagger which he laid by his bedside every night.

At last a combination of circumstances touched off the poet. Just when he was suffering most from his attachment to the wife of one of his friends Goethe heard of the death of Jerusalem occasioned by a similar attachment. Prohibiting the visit of friends and casting out of his mind everything except this subject and almost unconsciously like a somnambulist without any prearranged scheme of the whole, the poet poured out his long pent-up feelings like the bursting forth of a mighty stream and wrote *Werther* in four weeks. And then like a man who has made a great confession Goethe felt freed of his "stormy element," as he put it, healthy-minded and happy again, and ready for a new life.

The book exactly hit the temper of the times. It was a match that blew up an immense mine, that suddenly brought demands, unsatisfied passions, and imaginary wrongs to an eruption. Its success was quick and immense. It was read by high and low. It spread like a raging fire across the continent and to foreign lands. It treated the theme of an unhappy love affair in such a way that it expressed the passions and yearnings of an entire age. Countless people felt that for them was portrayed the right and wrong of their overflowing hearts in their relations to the harsh workaday world and to their strivings for freedom amid the confining circumstances and frustrations in such a world.

Not a few people claim that *Werther* is Goethe's greatest work, while perhaps the majority give the laurels to *Faust*. Anyway, the poet was never again to hit the popular mood so precisely. Among the great poets Germany's greatest was one of the few along with Byron and Burns to be suddenly clothed with fame in early youth.

Werther was just one of the many expressions and phases of Goethe's universality and yet not for many years was he to attain the universal mind posterity knows him to have had. We can, however, see the slow building up of this mind that went on before and after the publication of its first great work.

Long before our poet was born on August 28, 1749, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, that city, we might say, was preparing to play a part in forming the universality of Germany's greatest mind. With numerous remnants and memorials of old German life and of feudal times combined with distinctive modern ideas and great industrialism, Frankfort had a many-sided life. A meeting place for many travelers by way of the Rhine-stream, the city was representative of Europe and had a cosmopolitan atmosphere. Before and after his university days the young Goethe roamed its streets and closely observed the many types of life in all classes.

Heredity and early home life played their parts in forming the universal mind of the poet. From his father the boy inherited hunger for knowledge and a delight in communicating knowledge. From his mother he inherited animal spirits, a rare personal charm, love of everything bearing the stamp of distinctive individuality, and a great liking for people. In his home he met many great writers and prominent political men and the leisurely life of his home gave ample opportunity for study and high conversation. He was a precocious child, and a quick and avid student. Before he was eight he could read and write German, French, and Greek, and his many other interests very early in life included the study of mathematics, music, drawing, and philosophy. Young Wolfgang was particularly clever in the invention of stories and the writing of verses.

Sent by his father first to Leipzig and then to Strasbourg to study law the exploring and adventurous young man roamed these university cities at large, attended classes in literature and science, studied architecture and music, took dancing lessons, went much to the theatres and into society, and became immersed in several love affairs. One of his favorite pastimes was seeking out and conversing with distinguished visitors to Leipzig and Strasbourg.

After graduating from Strasbourg on August 6, 1771, Goethe went home to Frankfort to practice law which he did very little. During those years his lifelong tendency to become easily excited by new interests and to throw his energies in many directions was the most intense. When a subject took strong hold of him he would shut himself off from people and write for days at a stretch, as he did when he wrote *Werther*. Then for a considerable period he could not produce anything at all, even when he most wished to do so, and often he would suffer from ennui. To keep life zestful and to exercise all his faculties he was obliged, he tells us, to devote the intervals when Nature (spelled by him with a capital N) ceased to influence him, to worldly occupations. Evidently he regarded creative writing as the expression of his true nature or Nature expressing itself through him, and not a worldly occupation. He would travel extensively for weeks, especially with distinguished men such as Lavater and Basedon. Then he would give himself to a long and thorough study of some historical or scientific subject. From it he would quickly turn to the writing of a critical article. With extraordinary exuberance of spirit

and love for fun-making he would throw himself into some gay social affair. Tiring of this he would roam the countryside in solitary walks at times with feelings of melancholy and depression. Vigorous activity and lifelessness, intense study and intense creative writing, love-making and fellowship with boon companions, joyousness and dejection alternated in him, often rapidly. No wonder his friends said that he could not be expected to act like anyone else. But all the time with his manysidedness, with his historical range and perspective, and with his seeing the varied life about him with every pore of his skin he was forming the universal mind that is one of the great amazements of history.

Also, during his last few years in Frankfort, we note Goethe's growing reference to interior truth, a characteristic of the German mind, Emerson said, but unusually developed in our poet. Back in his student days at Leipzig the tendency to write out of himself had begun. After much floundering about in his consideration of many types of subject matter and of many methods of writing, he was compelled, he says, to seek for everything within himself. This habit of putting his delights, his troubles, his inspirations, in fact all things that took strong hold of his mind, into poems came to its full blossoming in Frankfort. Finding his motivating force, his suggestions, and his material in himself is what largely sets Goethe apart from Shakespeare and the greater Greek poets who for the most part took what happened to other people as the primary motive of their works. Our German poet poetized his own joys and woes. Nearly every one of his characters was his own mouthpiece. Werther was Goethe at one time in Goethe's life. Faust was the essential Goethe all through Goethe's life. Since the poet reacted intellectually and emotionally so strongly to a many-sided life, felt so widely and deeply and richly within himself, his writing out of his own mind and heart accounted in no small measure for the universality we find in his writings.

That his writing out of himself did not prevent him from being objective is both an evidence and a cause of Goethe's universality. We admire his detached and disinterested way of looking at a thing. He could regard a matter purely for what it was in itself, apart from preconceived ideas that he and others held about it, free from bias, from any wish to make it other than it was, from any desire to use it for a special interest or cause. And so he could say "whatever is useful is only a part of what is significant," and make a character in *Wilhelm Meister's Travels* say, "We do not want to establish anything or to produce any outward effect, but only to enlighten ourselves."

Unable to see that he related every fact or cause to universal nature and judged it by its ability to promote universal truth, many Germans regretted his lack of intense nationalism and called him unpatriotic. Unable to get him to adopt their particular religious beliefs and ways of life, many called him unreligious, and even anti-religious. Those who ridiculed the Bible got no sympathy from him, while he offended the narrow-minded literalist by urging honest investigation of the Bible. And he was probably condemned by most religious sects for commending a person who was trying to found a sect to be called Hypsistari, or communion of those who would choose the best out of all religions. This universal mind saw segments, partialities, half-truths, political parties, nationalities, and religious sects with their limitations and judged their worth in their relations to universal truth. It belonged to no particular age or country or race or religion but to the best in all. How men are divided, Goethe thought, by religions, patriotisms, and politics! So he greatly rejoiced, especially during the latter years of his life, in the growing cosmopolitanism of art and science as one of the most healthy and promising signs of the time. High above all frontiers this great humanist would raise the common human ideals of the good, the true, and the beautiful. He would unite the best men of all lands in a common zeal for the exaltation of letters, science, and art. Enlightenment would spread from such men, he believed, and gradually permeate the masses.

Come back again to Weimar and look at Goethe there. The Grand Duke Charles Augustus was so impressed by the genius and personality of the young poet that he invited Goethe to come for a visit and sent a carriage to bring him. Then when Karl August, as he was generally called, got the poet there he was so delighted with his discovery that he made every possible effort in the way of gifts and honors to make the visitor stay, some say to be his counsellor in the affairs of state, but chiefly, I think, because the pleasure-loving Duke of eighteen wanted Goethe to share his sports and amusements and to adorn the little town of some six thousand people. For over fifty years Germany's greatest writer lived in Weimar and developed his universality. For the first ten years he gave himself almost entirely to the affairs of the state as the Duke's counsellor and wrote hardly anything. From all over Germany protesting voices cried: "What a shame for our greatest poet to be wasting his time and hindering his genius by taking care of mines and forests and fire departments, developing the army, and putting the Duke's bad financial affairs in order!" So they said and most biographers of Goethe have said the same. The poet wasted, many claim, the best ten years of his life, the years between twenty-five and thirty-five, for poetic production.

We do not agree. His immersion in practical affairs, we believe, gave Goethe opportunities to observe phases of life that he would not otherwise have observed, at least not so closely. Does not such work serve to prevent what novelist Arthur Koestler recently called "the intellectual's estrangement from reality"? Many great writers have done work other than writing, and not a few, notably Robert Burns and Robert Frost, have written great things about and out of their non-literary activities. Even when a writer does not write directly out of his non-literary work does not such work give him rest and refreshment of mind, understanding of human nature, larger perspective on life, and keener appetite for writing that increase his power to write? Goethe's participation in many forms of activity, including practical affairs of state, we stoutly claim, did much to develop his universal mind and to increase his effectiveness as a writer.

There are always people who think they know what is best for other people. There were such people in Goethe's day and they tried their best to keep our poet in the narrow track they had set for him. They urged him to get out of state affairs and they tried to laugh and ridicule him out of scientific experimenting and writing. Partly because they thought that in science a poet was out of his realm and partly because they were not ripe for his advanced scientific theories, the scientists of his day, except a few great ones, either ignored or scorned Goethe's scientific writings. To be

sure, they did have some reasons, for the poet did make himself ridiculous in his claim that he had disproved Sir Isaac Newton's discovery that by the aid of a prism glass white light can be broken up into prismatic hues. But our poet-scientist did, however, make some important and far-reaching discoveries in geology, mineralogy, meteorology, osteology, and biology, and he was remarkably anticipatory of modern ideas in botany. Linné, the great Swedish botanist, was the dominant thinker in this branch of science at that time, and most people went along with him when he declared that so many thousand species had been brought into being on Creation Day, that each rigidly adhered to its type, and that the work of the botanist was merely to register and describe these unchanging species. But Goethe forecast one of the chief principles of evolutionary botany in finding both centripetal and centrifugal tendencies at work, that is, inner tendencies or impulses to keep the type and also, in different surroundings, tendencies to diverge from the type, and that under the influence of some surroundings the species did actually change. And so this great poet showed himself to be an advanced scientist in believing in historical evolution at least twenty years before his great contemporary, Jean Baptiste Lamarck, propounded the theory. Indeed, for his time, Goethe's grasp of living nature was extraordinary. This original, independent thinker in science was given his deservedly eminent place when Helmholtz, a distinguished German physiologist, wrote, "to Goethe belongs the great fame of having first conceived the leading ideas to which science in those days was tending and through which its present form is determined."

Goethe was one of history's greatest, perhaps its greatest, example and representative of self-culture. No man worked more earnestly and zealously on himself. Just as he tried in his student days to rid himself of giddiness, which overcame him on high places, by climbing often to the top of the Strasbourg spire and standing for a long time on a narrow ledge, so through his long life of eighty-two years he strove just as painstakingly to remove his intellectual defects and limitations. Early in life he wrote to Lavater: "The desire to raise the pyramid of my existence, the base of which is already laid, as high as possible into the air absorbs every other desire, and scarcely ever quits me." Indeed, from his earliest years there was about him a wonderful intensity and concentration in giving himself to persons and objects until he had learned all they had to impart that could help him. He appropriated to himself, as he once said, what was offered to the century by its best minds, and we would add what was offered by the best minds of all ages.

To be sure, his progress in self-development was not always steady and even. There were slumps and barren periods. Then there would come remarkable awakenings and rejuvenations, such as those brought about by his sojourn in Italy which moved him to resolve to give himself more to art and science and less to state affairs. He was in a barren period during which, as he said, "the seed was thick in the soil but the winter snows lay upon it" when Schiller came into his life. The warm touch of the younger man, Goethe said, brought springtime again to him, and, as we know, inspired one of the greatest literary flowerings in the life of the older poet. The visitor to the Weimar market place today is strikingly reminded of one of the most beautiful friendships in literature as he looks at the remarkable bronze statue representing Goethe handing the laurel wreath of poesy to the younger poet.

But with Goethe it was self-culture for the sake of self-culture, many say. He existed for the cultivation of himself, not chiefly for what he could accomplish, but what could be accomplished through him, it is claimed. There is some truth in this, we must admit. Also, we regret with Emerson that Goethe's interest in his moral well-being and in the moral well-being of others was not equal to his interest in the intellectual. And yet to his credit let it be said that he courageously sought truth regardless of what people thought. That he did not always think of his own culture above general culture is shown by his many services to the University of Jena and by the fact that he did not attach his name to the many epigrams he wrote for a magazine that he put out in cooperation with Schiller. Also, I think that in the deepest sense and in the long run one enriches the lives of his fellowmen more by improving his own culture than by direct efforts to improve them. Being is more important and effective than doing. People generally, I believe, are more likely to take something and even to go after something from a man who stands independently on his own rich culture than from a man who deliberately and obviously tries to improve them, even though at times there is likely to be the need of the second man. Anyway, at least we see the universal man in the wide, rich culture that Goethe derived from the best in all ages and manifested in his varied and great accomplishments as poet, novelist, art critic, translator, editor, lawyer, counsellor of state, dramatist, theatre manager, actor, and scientist.

Was Goethe irreligious or anti-religious or pagan? All three attributes have been ascribed to him. Or was his religion too large for little minds to grasp and appreciate? Carlyle evidently thought it was. Once at a religious convention a few leaders were saying that it was lamentable that their greatest contemporary poet should be so opposed to religion. The great Scotch writer squirmed in his seat until he could contain himself no longer and then shouted at one of Goethe's detractors: "Hoot, man, hoot! You remind me of the man who berated the sun because it would not light his cigar."

With the influence of Spinoza, his favorite philosopher, upon him, our German thinker held that God and nature are identical. In one of his poems in a short series called *Gott und Welt* he wrote: "God must be one who moves the world within, nature in Him, Himself in nature holding," and again, "There is a universe within the soul." So far as God was a person, He was identical with Goethe's own personality, the very inmost core and essence of that. While he greatly admired Christ as man and teacher and shared much of the religion of the New Testament, he had little use for the religion embodied in abstract propositions and creeds. His position was near to that developed by Hellenism and the neo-Platonists. To him the religious life was one of balance, calmness, serenity, free from strife and discordant elements, lived in complete harmony with the divine cosmic order.

Goethe was olympian. He stood on the mountain heights. Not in the power of any mood or passion, not as the servant of any particular dogma or cause, with no axe to grind or private interest to promote, he

looked calmly and disinterestedly from the lofty heights and with mental superiority surveyed the systems of thought and the human life of the ages as they were. To be sure, he was not always on the heights. He was a manly man who heartily enjoyed the game of life in its myriad forms, especially such practical matters as conducting state affairs and managing a theatre. And yet there was that original, independent stamp upon his writings that comes chiefly from a man who gets away from life and calmly views it from a distance. This combination of letting life pour through him as he intensely and richly lived it and of solitary, aloof looking at life accounts for his profound depth and wide range that Carlyle admired so much. This combination accounts for his keen penetration into the minds and souls of men and for his dealing with the spirit of life, as he did especially in his novel *Wilhelm Meister*, while so many other writers dealt merely with the costume and condition of life. This combination accounts largely for his being such an inexhaustible fountain of knowledge and wisdom, for his being, as few men have, the incarnation of humanity and of the ages.

To Emerson's claim that Goethe was the soul of his age, we would add that he was the soul of the ages. His perspective ran over all history and he wrote about universal and timeless matters. How he bewildered the people of his day by being at various times the poet of passion, the superb creator of character, the keen investigator, the royal sage, and nature's serene and great interpreter! And he amazes us today by his universality that greatly helps to lift us out of our limitations and to free us from the bondages that religious bigotries, racial prejudices, and intense nationalisms so often put upon us. Goethe encourages us to have large minds, to seek truth honestly and eagerly from all sources, and to follow the truth we find.

How Religious Are You?

WILLIAM P. JENKINS

Recently a young man called me to inquire about the Unitarian position on marrying divorced people. I told him that as in a great many other matters there is no Unitarian position, but that I do marry divorced people on occasion. Thereupon he gasped a sigh of relief, replying, "I belong to another church which will not, so what is a poor fellow to do?" He went on to explain that while he was nominally an Anglican, he had heard about Unitarians before, and knew something about our activities and our point of view. "Actually," he continued, "I am much more of a Unitarian than anything else, but I am really not very religious." I do not know this young man well enough to judge the accuracy of that statement, but it is one which you and I hear again and again. How often people say, "well after all I am not very religious." It is no wonder that this young man and so many other people in our society say, "I am not a religious person." It is because they are measuring a religious person by the standards of religiosity that rule in our society.

Just what are those standards? If we see a person who goes to church once or twice every Sunday, who does not go to the movies or play cards or dance, who has religious mottoes in his home, who attends church meetings, and who dons the proper shade of blue on Sunday afternoon, we call him religious. Or if we know of someone who adopts an attitude of disdain toward worldly matters, who lives in a realm of fancy, and who spends much time in prayer, we say that such a person is religious. Naturally we are going to say that, if this is the definition of religiosity, we are not religious people.

I think, for example, of the brothers Huxley. One is Aldous, whose writings are mystical. His books are full of mysticism, and we should probably regard him as a religious person. But his brother Julian who is far from being a mystic, who calls himself a scientific Humanist and who goes about trying to establish a better world, would be called non-religious, even irreligious by some.

There is still another qualification which goes with our description of the religious person. If we see one who is gullible and superstitious, we are inclined to think that he is religious. Being religious to a great many people means rejecting life and believing something that just is not so. So many think of faith in these terms: that religious faith is believing in something that is hard to accept; that if it is not absolutely untrue, it has great suspicions of being so. You are considered religious if you can believe this in the face of reason and the facts. Being religious to many is possessing these qualifications of practising rituals, of having mottoes and icons hanging on the wall, of disdaining this life and of accepting things that just are not so. And strange to say, all of this is done in the name of a man who damned ritual and superstition, and who called upon the religious leaders of his own time for observance of the weightier matters of the law. You remember it was Jesus who, in castigating the Pharisees, said, "Ye tithe mint, anise and cumin, but have neglected the weightier matters of the law, of justice and of mercy." Or perhaps you recall the story of Zacchaeus, the tax collector and money lender, who one day amid a great crowd climbed a tree so that he could see this man Jesus. And Jesus invited him to come down and join with him and go to his house for dinner, ignoring the presumably righteous, because Jesus thought this man had some real qualities of religion. Or you think of the parable of the last judgment, in which he said that many people will be surprised, because they will be rejected for those who were just and kind and merciful. True religion is often found outside the tenets of orthodoxy, perhaps more truly than within it.

If this be true, what are the qualities that make a person religious in the best sense of the word? Well I should say first of all that to be a religious person we must have a desire to know and a desire to understand. We must be inquisitive, we must be seekers after the light and the truth. We must be willing to follow the paths of knowledge and of understanding wherever they may lead. That means a desire to know the world in which we live, to know what sort of a universe we live in, to know if there is any relation

between us and the stars, and, if so, what that relation really is. We must know our fellow human beings and know what our relationship is toward them. I would mark this desire to know, coupled with the desire to understand, as the first quality of being religious. This is not held so by large numbers of people today. On the contrary, ignorance seems to be exalted by a great many religious groups, and reason is disdained by some of the most eminent theologians of our time. We are not to seek knowledge and understanding. We are to accept the knowledge and understanding of some past era. We are told that the clergy of our time are more and more being recruited from the less intelligent members of our society because those who are more intelligent have too much desire to know, and so seek other fields of endeavor. This is said by leaders of a great many theological schools as well as by others.

But such was not always the case. In primitive society the priest and the medicine man were the most learned in society. If anyone had knowledge and if anyone sought further knowledge it was the medicine man or the priest. Or if we look at medieval Christianity, the highest education was given those who were religious leaders. Thomas Aquinas is perhaps the supreme example, a man whose knowledge reached the limits of everything that could be known in his time. Or I think again of Harvard University which has stayed true to that tradition. Harvard University was not founded as a great scientific institution, it was not founded as a graduate school, but for the training of religious leaders, because the people of Massachusetts believed that the leader in religion should be the best educated, should be the kind of man who seeks knowledge and understanding to the very limits that it can be pursued. Heresy is more frequent among theologians and theological students because many of them are driven by this desire for knowledge and understanding, and as they pursue knowledge, and as they engage in the pursuit of understanding they find that many of the statements that are told them are not true; and so they depart from the ways of their fathers.

So I should say that the clergy and the so-called religious people who reject knowledge and who are narrow in their outlook are the irreligious people of our age. The religious people are those who seek a breadth of understanding, who seek to understand their fellow human beings and the universe in which they live, with the best means and tools that lie at hand in this scientific age. And knowledge and understanding lead to the next quality of the religious person: vision and idealism. The young man who telephoned me to see about getting married had called me because he had heard me on a radio broadcast when I was talking about world government. It led me to think of the man who popularized the term, "One World." Here was a man of understanding, a man of good education, and a man of vision and idealism. He was not a religious leader, he was a corporation lawyer, and his name was Wendell Wilkie. I suppose many people would have said that Wilkie was not a religious person, but Wilkie had the qualifications of a religious person because he had a vision of one world which was beyond the vision of the ordinary person. Or I think again of Abraham Lincoln. Surely there was a man of great breadth of understanding and of high ideals, a man of great vision, of great vision for his nation, and of vision for the peoples of the world. Yet Abraham Lincoln never joined the church and was very seldom seen inside one. From the standards that I have mentioned, the acceptable standards of religiosity, Abraham Lincoln was not a religious man, although a great many religions have tried to claim him since, because of his popularity. But here is true religion in a politician and a statesman. One could continue to mention the men and the women of great ideals and of great vision in our time. A man like Darrow, who attacked religion, or men like Huxley, H. G. Wells, or George Bernard Shaw—these men have had vision, the real vision of what society should be like. Yet they were not within the enclosures of religious organizations. The social vision of the prophets of Israel and of the prophets of other lands and nations is possessed by the really religious people today. Those who go to church and who hang mottoes on their walls and who say their prayers, but who do not have this social vision, are irreligious people.

The third quality of a religious person is faith. Faith to be genuine must be based on the other things that I have mentioned. Faith is not faith unless it is based on the best knowledge available. Faith is different from superstition which is based on ignorance. Faith based on the best of knowledge and the breadth of understanding and the vision that comes with it—that is a religious quality. A faith based on these can be made real. I find that is the kind of faith people are seeking today, that is the kind of faith that motivates those who say, "I am not really a religious person," because they do not believe in a superstitious faith. But many of them find, when they consider the matter carefully, that they really have a faith, that they are not negative people as they sometimes think they are, that they have a faith that is based on knowledge. It may not take the flights of fancy that other faiths take. But it is a faith based on knowledge, understanding,

---

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 82)

fear of exercising one's own rights, or by suppression of the rights of others."

President Truman, in his veto message, said that the bill would "interfere with our liberties" and would put the government into the "thought control business." The President also pointed out that the bill would give government vast "powers to harass all of our citizens in the exercise of their right of free speech," that it would antagonize friendly governments, and would aid potential enemies by requiring the publication of a complete list of vital defense plants, laboratories, and other installations.

Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, an outspoken critic of the controversial legislation, has said that he would take steps to enforce the law with utmost vigor, and would ask the Budget Bureau for more money to staff a special unit to carry out the law's many provisions. Congress, before recessing, did not appropriate any funds to administer the law.

—*Feature Press Service.*

and ideal vision, one that says, "These things that I visualize, these things that I know from my understanding of the world and of human nature can be made real."

Perhaps it is not inevitable that the good life will come, but it is possible, and that is the faith which motivates Unitarians. It is the faith which believes that the good life is possible, that we live in a universe of orderliness upon which we can rely. It is the faith which believes that within the heart of every man there is the divine spark which drives him on, that within the heart of every human being is the potential to build a good world. It is the faith which believes that the problems, the grave and desperate problems of economics and politics, the problems of poverty and the problems of war can be solved if human beings will have knowledge, understanding and vision.

The final qualification of the truly religious person is a full life of action based on these other principles—a life not of madness but of real action, a full life based on knowledge, understanding, vision, and faith. This I believe is the description of a religious person. We must ask ourselves if we have those qualifications. In questioning whether we are religious or not, we must ask ourselves not whether we pray three times a day, not whether we are regular in our church attendance, not whether we believe things that are inacceptable to the reason, not whether we disdain life and seek to flee from it, but whether we really seek knowledge or try to learn everything we possibly can learn and know in this world. Do we seek through that knowledge to have an understanding of the vast universe of which we are a part? Do we seek to answer the questions of why and when and how and where in regard to the universe and ourselves? Do we try, through this search for understanding, to relate ourselves to the nature of which we are a part? Even more important, do we seek with the knowledge that lies at hand, with all the discoveries of the physical and biological and social sciences, to get a better understanding of our fellow human beings? Do we seek to understand as well as we possibly can the people of our community and of our nation and of the whole wide world? For unless we seek this knowledge, and unless we seek this breadth of understanding we must answer "No" to the question, "Are we religious?" But if we can answer "Yes," that we do seek that knowledge and that understanding, to that extent at least we are religious people.

Out of all this, does there come to us a vision of the world as it might be, a vision of the possibilities and the hopes of peace and prosperity, peace on earth and good will among men? Do we have a faith that our vision can be realized, that that vision can be actualized among men and women? We need not believe that we shall achieve a blessed paradise where there are no problems for human beings, but that we shall achieve an earth that is peaceful and prosperous enough wherein we can solve these problems that face us from time to time. Do we have a faith that asserts that we can solve them, that we can build a better world for all mankind?

We cannot answer "Yes" to the question, "Are we religious?" unless we can say that we live according to our knowledge and our understanding, that we live according to our vision and our faith. How religious are you? Only you can answer that by your search for knowledge and understanding, by the breadth of your vision, the strength of your faith, and the power of your will to act.

Seven Stanzas for Man

I

Crying "Lord!", crying "Lord!", crying "Lord!",
the contrite
soul meets tufted anguish in the tufted night;
crying "Lord!", crying talisman words in the night.
The words lie on pillow, prostrate to the name of
God;
it is dark, but their neon sense is visible;
presumes the sayer to glory out of guilt,
off the easy counterweight of self-detraction.
O facile sayer, thou wilt, simply thou wilt:
Breast-stroke, knee-bend, nod;
effortless like capillary action.
Do you sleep, sayer, comforted? Is anguish still?

II

Rise, *Adoremus* and *Confiteor,*
leap from narcotized bed, and thence,
like lambkins, to Supreme Expedience,
unheard, unfelt, un-waited for.

III

"I adore . . . (only sandy barrens, insular
to myself; nor understand how lone is an isle).
I confess . . . (only wistful shift to avatar
from sloth; and do not really know my wile)."

IV

Man is not hard-shelled, being fragile like a reed;
not essentially a fool to be put off with fable;
he is talented, being small like a germ.
God is not answers, but questions; and man is able
to adventure upon them, being persistent like a worm,
weak like a seed.

V

The world is beautiful with blue hills and green
oceans,
and with pebbled walks and with garrulous springs;
beautiful with patina and time and the motions
of winds and rivers, and with reflective things
that come of men incredibly,
ingenious things, yet simply come . . . Van Rign
with mirroring canvas; Stradivari
forming his shells, thumping, ear acock;
scratching his tit-tat-toes on space, Einstein;
and even old baggy Jones with his watchman's clock.

VI

O sky, are you Heaven or calculus?
Shall we still with blindness look, with deafness listen
for Sequined Beard to glisten
and Fiat Voice to sound for us?

VII

God is ubiquitous in a stroke of ink,
in a plow cleaving soil, in a pick at a vein of coal,
in the halves of a bread-loaf cut between John and Paul;
the link for a link
that wise men speak of when they speak of soul.
Wise men will not cringe that that is all.

LeGarde S. Doughty.

Religion Versus

SHELDON SHEPARD

Basic to any marked improvement in human relationships on a permanent and world-wide scale is confession that religion needs to be improved. Too often we assume perfection in those agencies whose growth and betterment is a condition precedent to the solution of problems for which we offer their services. Recently an outstanding religious leader, after surveying the failures of society and threatening tragedies of human life, declared that our hope lies in "the home, the church, the school." I wondered as I heard him if it would not be more honest, or at least more discerning, to say that home and church and school have had charge of our minds and hearts during all these years in which the present kind of world has been set up. Then we might say that since these three agencies are so very influential in moulding the ideas and patterns of men and women our hope lies in their improvement.

A character in Philip Wylie's novel, *Night Unto Night,* points out one of the bases of our faulty reasoning in this way:

> School children are taught that civilization has been achieved. That is a basic error. Willa and Willie must be undeceived about it. Humanity is still part barbaric, part medieval, and at best only part civilized. That is what should be taught in every school. Teaching civilization as a *fait accompli* makes kids accept the world in its current state as a properly finished product. It renders them unable to fight against their own local barbarisms because they cannot discern them. It makes smug, stultified citizens. Whatever else is allowed to kids, they are entitled to learn that America to date is a rank bust in many departments, as are all other countries. That we are hard-trying, slowly succeeding barbarians.

We do grow up in an environment of the assumption of perfection of our civilization, ideas, and institutions. All children learn that the race has progressed, but few ever hear that all its thoughts and practices are still in imperfect, incomplete stages, and that the future beckons as truly as the past has pushed us on. We accept present institutions and mores as final and satisfactory. In every country citizens grow up with convictions of its superiority. Nazism was only the full feverish crisis of the disease of assumed superiority of race and nation, whose germ infects us all. In the home the child is conditioned to the idea of the complete wisdom and integrity of his parents. "Because I say so" is sufficient reason for any command. He never learns that adults should become better, only that he should be obedient to their wishes. So when he becomes a parent he thinks that he is all-wise and sufficient. In a small town, after I had given a lecture which involved some references to child training and development, a huge raw-boned, grimy man walked belligerently down the aisle. Before any one else had begun to move, he thrust a dirty fist in my face and shouted: "You are in great business, ain't you, running around the country telling other people how to run their own kids!" His idea was the general one that all one needs to be able to guide children is to be able to procreate or bear them.

Religion has been perhaps the worst offender of all. Nearly every religion teaches its own superiority. So much so that most persons can hardly think of having a religion unless it is the one true religion. Most studies in comparative religion are presented for the purpose of proving the superiority of the studying group's system. Each child is taught that his church holds the final truth and adult minds are squeezed into the same formula.

Very few patriots or religious enthusiasts can recognize the faults of their country or religion. They are, by that very failing, among the strongest barriers against the progress of their own beloved nation or church. Few recognize the necessity, the inevitability of progress and change in their honored institutions. So the tide of time piles up against the bulwarks of conservatism, halting progress for a time, compelling it to come by sudden and tragic action when the dam gives way.

Strife among religions is out of date; it belongs, if anywhere, to an age in which all religion was not threatened as it is today. Gen. James H. Doolittle recognized the necessity for discovering the deep strata of our common religious welfare when he said: "The time has come for all religious beliefs to band together against atheism." Explaining his terms he went on:

> Religion, to me, means recognizing the existence of God, and the conduct of life in accordance with His precepts. It requires adherence to the Golden Rule and opposes the law of expediency, which tries to tell us that "the end justifies the means." It is exemplified in the worship of God, in kindness, unselfishness, honesty, decency, morality, and law.

It is the General's conviction that all persons who regard themselves as religious under the definition he gives should think of themselves as being in common cause. The importance of that common cause, and the threat of common danger to that cause, outrank the significance of any of their differences. He even maintains that "the advancement of religion and religious tolerance is far more important than the promotion of any specific religious faith or group."

It is too true that religious fervor is largely expended against other religions. Persons who believe in God and attempt to live by the Golden Rule devote sacred energies to working against other persons who believe in God and try to live by the Golden Rule. It is time we discover our deep unity, and learn who our enemies are. Religion must soon learn that the thin lines separating believers merely mark brigades in the single army. They are not battle lines. The battle lines are drawn, huge and coarse, between all believers on one hand and the forces of materialism, selfishness, and inhumanity on the other.

Most people—and this applies as much to those who call themselves Christians as to others—have grown to adulthood without developing a generous, spontaneous capacity to love: to affirm others. Instead, they have grown to adulthood carrying with them fears and hostilities born of childhood failures and intensified by a continued effort to effect a childish, not a responsible and mature, relationship to life. By and large, they have been unable to apply the insight of Jesus of Nazareth because what they have called love, even in their most intimate associations, has not been love.

—*Harry Overstreet.*

The Study Table

Metaphysics

A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. *By William S. Morgan. New York: Philosophical Library. 413 pp. $6.00.*

This is essentially a treatise on metaphysics. The first section is introductory, the second deals with epistemology, the next two with Reality as Causal and as Ethical, and the last with the relations and destiny of man. Of the usual problems in a philosophy of religion, only God and immortality are given extensive treatment. Such topics as prayer, revelation, and religious authority are either largely passed over, or dealt with only by implication.

The author has obviously poured into this work many years of intensive study. He leans heavily upon Descartes, Kant, and Spinoza, but refreshingly includes such thinkers as Geulincx, Malebranche, Hutchenson, and Maine. We wonder, however, why such men as Dewey, James, Nietzsche, and Whitehead are only mentioned in passing, or omitted entirely.

The treatment is objective and definitely friendly to theism and the "holistic" view of reality and life. It is a highly specialized work which could contribute much to the thinking of teachers of the philosophy of religion, and would be a valuable reference work for any course in philosophy dealing with epistemology or metaphysics as a central concern.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Spiritualism As a Faith

ADVENTURES IN SURVIVAL. *By Belle Turner Daiches. Chicago: Aries Press. 177 pp. $2.00.*

Though dealing with the general theme of Psychical Research, *Adventures in Survival,* by Belle Turner Daiches, is primarily a defense of Spiritualism as a faith and more particularly of Camp Chesterfield in Indiana as the "Home of Psychic Phenomena." This last, in the judgment of many readers, will militate against its validity as an objective scientific study in the field the volume is designed to cover.

Without question, however, it is written with the utmost sincerity and bears the earmarks of genuine experience. Many of the phenomena are similar to those this reviewer has witnessed under the strictest scientific conditions, though he cannot altogether escape the opinion that the author's appraisal is not entirely unmotivated by the "will to believe."

Those already familiar with such phenomena, and who have accepted their validity, will discover much in the author's presentation which corroborates their own observations. Nonetheless, this reviewer does not feel that the volume will carry conviction to the critically minded unfamiliar with the highly technical problems of psychical research.

Despite the last sentence, though, the reviewer believes that many of the opinions expressed by the author in that portion of the book devoted to "Inferences" are worthy of serious consideration by those interested in a modern approach to religion. It is perhaps in these opinions, rather than in her accounts of the phenomena for which she vouches, that the value of the book is to be found.

HORACE WESTWOOD.

An Inclusive Volume

A HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS. *Edited by Vergilius Ferm. New York: The Philosophical Library. 642 pp. $6.00.*

This is the most recent addition to the impressive list of works in the area of philosophy and religion which Dr. Ferm has edited. Part I deals with ancient and medieval philosophies, and, refreshingly, includes those from the Orient not usually mentioned: Indian, Zoroastrian, Buddhist, Chinese, Arabic, and Islamic. Part II deals with the modern and recent. It includes not only the more traditional systems, but dialectical materialism, existentialism, panpsychism, and chapters on logic, epistemology, sciences, aesthetics, ethics, history, culture, and religion.

We might well raise the question as to whether it does not include too much, too skimpily handled. Yet the authors seem, on the whole, to be competent in their areas and to have done a good job within the limits of the space at their disposal. Certainly, for all who teach philosophy, and for all reference lists of general courses in the field, this book is an invaluable "must."

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

A Stirring Story

APOSTLE OF LIBERTY. *By Arnold Crompton. Boston: Beacon Press. 74 pp. $1.75.*

A thrilling story, long neglected, is now told in a brief, readable, and stirring form. Mr. Crompton makes the saving of California for the Union a living and vivid tale of a great dramatic period in American history. Starr King is portrayed with remarkable skill. The youthful, idealistic, and capable Unitarian minister who captured the loyality of California, and saved the state for the Union, stands out in clear lines as one of the great souls of American history. It is a story that all Americans should read.

CURTIS W. REESE.

As a Christmas Gift

Send UNITY to a new reader
1 Year for $1.50

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Blvd.
Chicago 15, Illinois

For the enclosed $1.50 send UNITY as a Christmas gift for one year to:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

UNITED APPEAL

Angora, Minnesota, is again this year the first church in the Conference to have met and paid its suggested share of the United Unitarian Appeal.

Howard Hauze, Chairman of the Conference Appeal Committee, reports that the returns are coming in slowly with the necessary information. He would like to have the name of the Appeal Chairman, the amount of the accepted goal, and the dates of the campaign for each church and fellowship unit. Send this information to him in care of the Conference Office.

Materials to aid in your Appeal Campaign can be obtained through the Conference Office. Among the things available are brochures for the chairman on methods and techniques and questions and answers on the Appeal. Also, for general distribution there are small pamphlets on the Western Unitarian Conference and the Unitarian Movement, its progress and hopes. Bulletin boards and posters can be had.

UNITARIAN SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Chicago Area campaign for the Unitarian Service Committee began with a kickoff banquet at the Congress Hotel. Talks were given by Marshall Field, Sr., and Miss Helen Fogg. Miss Fogg flew directly from Germany to Chicago for the Banquet. She reported on the second mission on Education and Child Care. Marshall Field complimented the Service Committee on the work it had done, expressed his personal interest in it, and stressed the importance of the work it is doing. The campaign is being conducted from November 15 to December 15.

The November 15th report of the Service Committee listed four Western Conference churches which had contributed over $500 to the Committee:

St. Louis, Missouri
St. Paul, Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Evanston, Illinois

IOWA-NEBRASKA CONFERENCE

The churches and fellowship units of Iowa and Nebraska met for their Annual Conference in Des Moines, Iowa, October 27-29, 1950. The meetings opened with the Judy Lecture, given this year by Dr. James Luther Adams, of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago and Meadville Theological School.

Two sessions were held on Saturday with Mr. Munroe Husbands, Director of Fellowship Units for the American Unitarian Association. Rev. John W. Brigham, Sioux City, Iowa, spoke at the luncheon on Liberal Religion on the Radio. Randall Hilton spoke on Unitarian Affairs.

At the banquet Saturday evening, Mr. Homer Kyle, of Lincoln, Nebraska, was toastmaster. The address was given by the Rev. Philip Schug, minister of the Lincoln church. The Sunday morning service was conducted by Rev. Charles W. Phillips, minister of the Des Moines church. The sermon was given by Rev. John W. Cyrus, Minister at Omaha.

MICHIGAN AREA CONFERENCE

The Michigan Area Unitarian Conference met at The Church of Our Father, Detroit, November 8-9, 1950. The major portion of the conference program was carried out on the workshop basis utilizing group dynamic techniques. This was under the general direction of Dr. Merrill E. Bush, Director of the Department of Adult Education and Social Relations of the American Unitarian Association. Leaders participating in this program in addition to Dr. Bush were Mrs. F. F. Hughes, Detroit; Rev. William Hammond, Grosse Pointe; Rev. and Mrs. Edward Redman, Ann Arbor; Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois.

In addition to the workshops, talks were given by Mrs. Harry Burns, Cincinnati, Alliance Director; Randall Hilton, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference; and Dr. Raymond B. Bragg, Executive Director of the Unitarian Service Committee.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Two committees were appointed by the Board of the Western Conference at its last meeting. The first one is a Committee on Religious Education. It is charged with the responsibility of stimulating a teacher training program and of serving as adviser to the Conference Board and the Geneva Institute Board. The members of the committee are:

Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Chairman.
Dr. William D. Headlee, Indianapolis.
Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, Chicago.
Mrs. Richard McCartney, Chicago.
Mrs. Charles Wilder, Kansas City.

This committee has sent out a questionnaire to the Religious Education Directors and chairmen. It plans to publish a news letter from time to time. In addition, it has taken responsibility for setting up certain religious education workshops at Geneva.

The second committee is one on College Centers. Rev. Arnold Westwood, Urbana, Illinois, was appointed chairman, with power to add to the committee. The specific responsibilities of this committee are to stimulate the college centers program in the Conference, including a college-age summer institute.

U.M.A. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee of the Unitarian Ministers Association met in Chicago on November 14. Besides transacting the business of the Association, they also met with the faculty and students of the Meadville Theological School. All members of the committee were present. The members are:

Robert Raible, Dallas, Texas, President
Napoleon W. Lovely, San Antonio, Vice-President
John W. Cyrus, Omaha, Secretary
Robert W. Sonen, Tulsa, Treasurer
Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago
Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska
Horace F. Westwood, Houston, Texas
Richard Kuch, Ft. Worth, Texas

SCHOLASTIC INSTITUTE

A Midwestern version of the Greenfield Group is being planned. Under the leadership of Dr. Thaddeus Clark, Rev. Max Gaebler, Dr. James Luther Adams, and Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, ministers from the Western and South Western Conferences will have an opportunity to meet and undertake serious study of perennial and current religious problems. Letters are going out inviting those ministers who wish to undertake the intellectual discipline and financial responsibility for such a scholastic enterprise to meet at Marquette State Park, Grafton, Illinois, January 29-31, 1951. This is a contribution that can be of great value to the ministerial leadership of these regions.

GENEVA, ILLINOIS

The old historic Unitarian church building has been renovated and completely redecorated. A modern heating plant has been installed. It has one of the most beautiful auditoriums in the Midwest. All of this has been done without borrowing and with less than $500 in unpaid bills as of date. The enthusiasm and progress made by this group during the past two years under the ministry of Dr. Charles Lyttle is really exciting. Since retiring from the faculty at Meadville, Dr. Lyttle has been devoting full time to the Geneva church. He has been its minister, on part-time until recently, for twenty-three years.

The story of this success was highlighted at the Fall Dinner held November 10. Speaking at this dinner were Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, who talked on the work of the Unitarian Service Committee, and Mr. Edward P. Droste, Headmaster of Elgin Academy, Elgin, Illinois. Mr. Droste spoke on the role of the private school in education.

HOBART, INDIANA

Two years ago the Hobart church had a membership of 45. Its membership now is over 60. That its continued growth is assured is indicated by the fact that the average attendance at church for this Fall is 67. The church school has grown from 6 to 36 in the same two years. Under the leadership of Mr. and Mrs. Philip Stafford, formerly of the University of Chicago and Chicago First Church choirs, an *a cappella* double quartette has been organized. It sings every other Sunday and performs with skill and interpretation equal to the very best. Plans are under way for enlarging the church facilities to provide for the growing church school and expanding program. Rev. Nelson Moore is the minister.

FIRST CHURCH, CHICAGO

The First Unitarian Church of Chicago is trying a novel experiment this fall. It is putting on one financial drive. This campaign includes the regular church budget, the United Unitarian Appeal, and the Unitarian Service Committee.

DETROIT—100 YEARS

The Detroit church celebrated its centennial October 7-8, 1950. The principal speaker at the Banquet, October 7, was Dr. Curtis W. Reese, President of the Western Unitarian Conference. Dr. Reese also spoke at the dedication of the Augustus P. Reccord Memorial. The Centennial Sermon, October 8, was given by Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association.

ROCKFORD—80 YEARS

The Rockford Unitarians utilized the month of October to celebrate their eightieth anniversary. On October 1, Dr. Charles P. Connolly, minister emeritus, gave the sermon. On October 15 the sermon was given by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, and on the 29th by Dr. Frederick May Eliot. The anniversary Banquet was held on November 2, with Dr. Preston Bradley as the speaker. Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., minister of the Rockford church, reports that the new wing recently constructed is already inadequate for the growing numbers and program of the church.

NELLIE WINGATE

Mrs. Nellie Wingate, for many years on the staff of the Meadville Theological School, died on October 9. Since her retirement she had been residing in Milwaukee. She will be remembered by several generations of Meadville students and her many friends in Chicago and Milwaukee.

KENNETH J. SMITH

Kenneth Smith has been called to the pastorates at Duluth and Virginia, Minnesota. He has accepted and already begun his ministry there.

NORTH CHURCH, INDIANAPOLIS

The North Unitarian Church of Indianapolis was accepted into the Unitarian Fellowship by the Board of the American Unitarian Association at its October meeting. Mr. Minton S. Nelson, chairman of the board of North Church, informs us that the church has invited Rev. John K. Hammon to become its minister. Mr. Hammon was graduated from Meadville Theological School in 1944. At the present time he is minister of the Unitarian Church of Kingston, Massachusetts.

ANNUAL MEETINGS

The Annual Meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference will be held in Evanston, Illinois, April 27-29, 1951. In accordance with the vote of the Conference Board, the following committee has been appointed to prepare the program:

Dr. Homer A. Jack, Chairman
Rev. Randall Hilton, Secretary
Mrs. R. D. Jessup
Dr. James Luther Adams
Mr. Malcolm Knowles

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE ANNUAL MEETINGS
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS, APRIL 27-29, 1951